

REMARKS

Summary of the Amendment

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1 and 33 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-19 and 22-33 will be pending with claims 1 and 33 being in independent form.

Summary of the Official Action

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-19 and 22-32 as failing to comply with Section 112, first and second paragraphs. The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 4-19, 25 and 33 on the basis of obviousness-type double patenting. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-19 and 22-33 over the art of record. By the present amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

Interview of September 28, 2004

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by Examiner Walls in the Interview of September 28, 2004. In that interview, Applicant's representative discussed, among other things, that the Section 112, first and second paragraph rejections were improper because page 15, lines 2-10, page 18, lines 4-5 and Figs. 1-3 provide full and clear support for the

P17233.A15

feature added to claim 1 in the Amendment filed on March 23, 2004, i.e., an electronic control that adjusts the pressure differential. The Examiner reviewed these portions of the specification and drawings with Applicant's representative and agreed to reconsider these rejections after reviewing Applicant's response to the instant Office Action. The Examiner further suggested that these rejections may be resolved by Applicant amending claim 1 to recite that both the adjustment device and the electronic control adjust the pressure differential and that it would be acceptable if claim 1 was amended to recite that "the electronic control is coupled to the adjustment device, whereby the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential."

Finally, it was pointed out to the Examiner that the obviousness-type double patenting rejections as well as the various obviousness rejections would be clearly overcome if claims 1 and 33 were amended to recite that "the electronic control is coupled to the adjustment device, whereby the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential" because none of the applied documents disclose or suggest adjusting a pressure differential as recited in claims 1 and 33, much less, doing so with an electronic control. Applicant's representative also noted that none of the applied documents disclose or suggest using both an adjustment device and an electronic control to adjust a pressure differential. Applicant further pointed out that the Examiner has set forth no motivation for combining the teachings of the documents and that the Examiner was improperly using Applicant's

P17233.A15

disclosure for as a basis for making the asserted combination. In response to these arguments, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the various prior art rejections after reviewing Applicant's response to the instant Office Action.

The Section 112, First Paragraph Rejection, is moot and/or traversed

Claims 1, 4-19 and 22-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and/or submits that this rejection has been rendered moot.

Applicant submits that the specification and drawings provide full and clear support for the feature recited in claim 1 which was added by the Amendment filed on March 23, 2004. As was pointed out in the Interview of September 28, 2004, the specification and drawings, and specifically page 15, lines 2-10, page 18, lines 4-5 and Figs. 1-3, provide full and clear support for the feature added to claim 1 in the Amendment filed on March 23, 2004, i.e., the above-noted disclosure provides full and clear support for an electronic control that adjusts the pressure differential.

Furthermore, in an effort to advance prosecution, Applicant has herein amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner to clearly indicate that the electronic control, e.g., device 62, is coupled to the adjustment device, e.g., device(s) 46, (as shown in e.g., Fig. 2) and that both the electronic control and the adjustment device participate in adjusting the pressure

P17233.A15

differential. Accordingly, Applicant submits that each issue indicated by the Examiner has been addressed.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection, is moot and/or traversed

Claims 1, 4-19 and 22-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out or distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and/or submits that this rejection has been rendered moot.

As explained above, and as acknowledged by the Examiner in the Interview of September 28, 2004, the specification and drawings provide full and clear support for the feature recited in claim 1 which was added by the Amendment filed on March 23, 2004. Again, the specification and drawings, and specifically page 15, lines 2-10, page 18, lines 4-5 and Figs. 1-3, provide full and clear support for the feature added to claim 1 in the Amendment filed on March 23, 2004, i.e., the above-noted disclosure provides full and clear support for an electronic control that adjusts the pressure differential.

Furthermore, in an effort to advance prosecution and address the section 112, first and second paragraph rejections, Applicant has herein amended claim 1 as suggested by the

P17233.A15

Examiner to clearly indicate that the electronic control, e.g., device 62, is coupled to the adjustment device, e.g., device(s) 46, (as shown in e.g., Fig. 2) and that both the electronic control and the adjustment device participate in adjusting the pressure differential. Accordingly, Applicant submits that each issue indicated by the Examiner has been addressed.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Double Patenting Rejections, are moot and/or traversed

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1, 4-19 and 22-33 (Applicant assumes that claims 22-32 are also rejected on this basis because these claims are discussed in the body of the rejection) over claims 1-9 of US patent 5,788,817 to BENTELE et al. in view of EP 0 752 495, as well as the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claim 25 over claims 1-9 of US patent 5,788,817 to BENTELE et al. in view of EP 0 752 495 and further in view of SMOOK (*Handbook for Pulp & Paper Technologists, 2nd Ed.*).

Notwithstanding the Office Action assertions, Applicant submits that the instant claims 1, 4-19, 25 and 33 recite a combination of features which are not disclosed or suggested by claims 1-9 of US patent 5,788,817 to BENTELE et al. in view of EP 0 752 495

P17233.A15

and with or without SMOOK.

Applicant notes that claims 1-9 of BENTELE recite a third roll which forms an additional nip with the backing roll of a first nip that includes first and second support elements. However, the claims of the instant application recite, among other things, that *the adjustment of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip and/or an electronic control coupled to an adjustment device, whereby the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential*. Applicant notes, in particular, that claims 1-9 of BENTELE contain no disclosure or suggestion with regard to adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements in order to *provide cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, i.e., adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements 6 and 11 in order to provide cross-section corrections in the roll nip formed by the backing roll 8 and the third roll 14. Nor does claims 1-9 of BENTELE disclose or suggest an electronic control, much less, *an electronic control coupled to an adjustment device*, much less, that *the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential*. To the contrary, the claims lack any such disclosure or suggestion and Applicant submits that the Examiner has not identified any such disclosure.

Applicant acknowledges that EP 0 752 495 apparently discloses a nip that is formed between first and second rolls 10 and 20 which utilize first and second support elements 13 and 23. However, Applicant submits that this document lacks any disclosure or suggestion

P17233.A15

with regard to, among other things, the combination of an additional roll nip formed by a third roll and one of the first and second rolls 10 and 20, much less, that *the adjustment of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, as recited in amended claims 1 and 33. Applicant emphasizes that it is not apparent from the figures of EP 0 752 495 that an additional roll nip formed by a third roll and one of the first and second rolls 10 and 20 is even contemplated. Moreover, the Examiner has identified no disclosure or suggestion in EP 0 752 495 with regard to adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements in order to *provide cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, i.e., adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements 13 and 23 in order to provide cross-section corrections in another roll nip formed by one of the rolls 10 or 20 and a third roll. Furthermore, it is apparent from the figures that EP 0 752 495 lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to *an electronic control*, much less, one *coupled to an adjustment device* and/or that *the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential*.

Finally, Applicant acknowledges that SMOOK describes the pressure distribution in a press nip and which indicates that the pressure is great in the center of the roll and decreases towards the roll ends. However, Applicant submits that this document lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to, among other things, the combination of a first roll nip formed by first and second rolls and an additional roll nip formed by a third roll and one

P17233.A15

of the first and second rolls, much less, that *the adjustment of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, as recited in claims 1 and 33. Moreover, the Examiner has identified no disclosure or suggestion in SMOOK with regard to adjusting the pressure differential in first and second support elements of the first and second rolls in order to *provide cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, i.e., adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements and in order to provide cross-section corrections in another roll nip formed by one of the first and second rolls and a third roll. Finally, it is clear from a fair reading of SMOOK that this document lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to *an electronic control*, much less, one *coupled to an adjustment device* and/or that *the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential*.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the asserted combination of teachings fail to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in the above-noted claims. It is also clear that the instant claims and those of BENTELE (as modified by EP '495 and/or SMOOK) relate to distinct subject matter.

Because each of the applied documents fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-noted features of the instant invention, Applicant submits that no proper modification or combination of these documents can render unpatentable the combination of features recited in at least claims 1 and 33.

P17233.A15

Further, even assuming, *arguendo*, that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these documents, (which Applicant submits it would not be), Applicant notes that such a combination would nevertheless fail to result in a device or method that includes the particular combination of features recited in amended claims 1 and 33. Moreover, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to modify any of these documents in a manner which would render obvious Applicant's invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion and conclusion of obviousness on the basis that the claims of BENTELE as modified by the disclosure of EP 0 752 495 with or without SMOOK.

Further, Applicant submits dependent claims 4-19 and 22-32 are allowable because no proper combination of claims 1-9 of BENTELE in view of EP '495, and that dependent claim 25 is also allowable because no proper combination of claims 1-9 of BENTELE in view of EP '495 and SMOOK, teaches or suggests, *inter alia*: the fibrous material web comprising at least one of a paper web and a cardboard web, as recited in claim 4; a line force differential between the shoe press unit and the counter roll being changeable with the pressure differential, as recited in claim 5; a cross-section of the pressure differential being produced lateral to the web travel direction, the cross-section of the pressure differential being changeable so different pressure differentials are adjustable over the width, as recited in claim 6; the line force in the roll nip changeable by way of the pressure differential, as

P17233.A15

recited in claim 7; line forces that are at least essentially even being adjusted in the roll nip by way of the variable pressure differential, as recited in claim 8; one of the pressure differential and the line force differential being continuously changeable in areas, as recited in claim 9; the internal pressure produced by the at least one first support element being changeable to change the pressure differential, as recited in claim 10; the internal pressure produced by the at least one second support element being changeable to change the pressure differential, as recited in claim 11; both the internal pressure produced by the at least one first support element and the internal pressure produced by the at least one second support element being changeable to change the pressure differential, as recited in claim 12; the at least one first support element and the at least one second support element being connected to the common pressure fluid line, the adjustment device comprising the adjustable pressure reduction device provided in at least one of the pressure fluid connection between the common pressure fluid line and the at least one first support element, and the pressure fluid connection between the common pressure fluid line and the at least one second support element, the pressure differential being changeable by the adjustable pressure reduction device, as recited in claim 13; at least one of the at least one first support element and the at least one second support element being connected to the common pressure fluid line one of individually, in groups, and all together, as recited in claim 14; the adjustable pressure reduction device being provided between at least one of the groups of the at least one second

P17233.A15

support element and the common pressure fluid line, thereby reducing the pressure of the at least one second support element connected to the common pressure fluid line in groups, as recited in claim 15; the adjustable pressure reduction device being provided between at least one individual at least one second support element and the common pressure fluid line, thereby reducing the pressure of the at least one second support element individually connected to the common pressure fluid line, as recited in claim 16; the adjustable pressure reduction device including at least one variably adjustable valve, as recited in claim 17; at least one of the pressure differential and the line force differential being externally adjustable, as recited in claim 18; at least one of the pressure differential and the line force differential being adjustable by one of mechanically, hydraulically, pneumatically, manually, by remote control, at the site, from a control position, and in a process-guided manner, as recited in claim 19; the pressure differential being adjustable by way of a regulating system that includes at least one closed regulation loop, as recited in claim 22; a line force in a second roll nip formed between the third roll and a fourth roll being changeable by way of the pressure differential, as recited in claim 23; at least one of the counter roll and the third roll being cambered, as recited in claim 24; the third roll, the fourth roll, and the counter roll being cambered, as recited in claim 25; the shoe press unit comprising a shoe press roll and the flexible press belt, the flexible press belt comprising a flexible press jacket, as recited in claim 26; the shoe press unit disposed above the counter roll, as recited in claim 27; the ends

P17233.A15

of the roll jacket of the counter roll being supported on the relevant carrier so that the roll jacket cannot move radially, as recited in claim 28; an action plane of the at least one second support element of the counter roll inclined slightly in relation to a second action plane of the at least one first support element of the shoe press unit, wherein an inclination angle lies in a range from about 2° to 15°, as recited in claim 29; the inclination angle lies in a range from about 4° to 8°, as recited in claim 30; an action plane of the at least one second support element of the counter roll coinciding, at least essentially, with a second action plane of the at least one first support element of the shoe press unit, as recited in claim 31; and comprising pressure-active surfaces of the at least one second support element being not equal to second pressure-active surfaces of the at least one first support element of the shoe press unit, as recited in claim 32.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the Obviousness-type Double Patenting rejections of the above-noted claims.

Traversal of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Over Bentele and EP '495

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 4-19 and 22-33 (Applicant assumes that claims 22-32 are also rejected on this basis because these claims are discussed in the body of the rejection) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over BENTELE in view of

P17233.A15

EP 0 752 495.

The Examiner acknowledges that BENTELE lacks, among other things, a pressure fluid line arranged to generate internal pressures by the first and second support elements, an adjustment device arranged to change a pressure differential between the internal pressures generated by the first and second support elements, that the first and second support elements are pressure fluid-actuated, that the first and second support elements are connected to a common pressure fluid line, and non-equal pressure-active surfaces. However, the Examiner asserted that EP '495 discloses these features and that it would have been obvious to modify BENTELE to include these features in view of the teachings of EP '495.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Notwithstanding the Office Action assertions as to what each of these documents disclose or suggest, Applicant submits that no proper modification or combination of the above-noted documents discloses or suggests: inter alia, an adjustment device arranged to change a pressure differential between the internal pressures generated by the at least one first support element acting on the flexible press belt of the shoe press unit, and the at least one second support element acting on the roll jacket of the counter roll, said adjustment device being structured and arranged to adjust the pressure differential as at least one of a function of a line force in the roll nip by predeterminable characteristic curves, and a function of line force correction procedures for the roll nip, and *an electronic control coupled to an adjustment device, whereby the*

P17233.A15

electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential, much less, that the line force correction procedures are at least one of input by way of an electronic control and produced by way of corresponding signals of a process guidance system, and that adjustment of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip, as recited in amended independent claim 1; and inter alia, adjusting with an electronic control and an adjustment device a pressure differential between internal pressures generated by the at least one first support element acting on the flexible press belt, and the at least one second support element acting on the roll jacket, the pressure differential adjusted by adjusting of the pressure of the fluid supplied to the at least one first support element and the at least one second support element, wherein the electronic control is coupled to the adjustment device, wherein the pressure differential is adjusted as at least one of a function of a line force in the roll nip by predeterminable characteristic curves and a function of line force correction procedures for the roll nip, wherein the line force correction procedures are at least one of input by way of an electronic control and produced by way of corresponding signals of a process guidance system, and wherein the adjusting of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip, as recited in amended independent claim 33.

As explained above, while BENTELE apparently discloses a third roll 14 which forms an additional nip with the backing roll 8 of a first nip that includes first and second support elements 6 and 11, it is clear that this document lacks any disclosure or suggestion with

P17233.A15

regard to *the line force correction procedures being at least one of input by way of an electronic control and produced by way of corresponding signals of a process guidance system*. Indeed, the Examiner has acknowledged that no such disclosure is contained in this document. It is also clear that BENTELE lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to *the adjustment of the pressure differential providing cross-section corrections in the roll nip*. To the contrary, BENTELE merely indicates, as col. 5, lines 49-50, that the regulating the pressure in support elements 6 and 11 “promotes the formation of a uniform second press nip”. Such language is hardly suggestive of adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements in order to *provide cross-section corrections in the roll nip*. Finally, it is clear that BENTELE fails disclose or suggest an electronic control, much less, one *coupled to an adjustment device and/or that the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential*.

Moreover, as explained above, Applicant does not dispute that EP ‘495 apparently discloses a nip that is formed between first and second rolls 10 and 20 which utilize first and second support elements 13 and 23. However, it is clear that this document lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to, among other things, the combination of an additional roll nip formed by a third roll and one of the first and second rolls 10 and 20, much less, that *the adjustment of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, as recited in amended claims 1 and 33. Applicant emphasizes that it is not apparent from the

P17233.A15

figures of EP '495 that an additional roll nip formed by a third roll and one of the first and second rolls 10 and 20 is even contemplated. Moreover, the Examiner has identified no disclosure or suggestion in EP '495 with regard to adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements in order to *provide cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, i.e., adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements 13 and 23 in order to provide cross-section corrections in another roll nip formed by one of the rolls 10 or 20 and a third roll. Applicant also submits that EP '495 lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to *the line force correction procedures being at least one of input by way of an electronic control and produced by way of corresponding signals of a process guidance system*. Indeed, the Examiner has acknowledged that no such disclosure is contained in this document. Finally, it is apparent that EP '495 similarly fails disclose or suggest an electronic control, much less, one *coupled to an adjustment device* and/or that *the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential*.

Because each of the applied documents fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-noted features of the instant invention, Applicant submits that no proper modification or combination of these documents can render unpatentable the combination of features recited in at least claims 1 and 33.

Further, even assuming, *arguendo*, that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these documents, (which Applicant submits it would not be), Applicant notes

P17233.A15

that such a combination would nevertheless fail to result in a device or method that includes the particular combination of features recited in amended claims 1 and 33. Moreover, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to modify any of these documents in a manner which would render obvious Applicant's invention.

Applicant reminds the Examiner of the guidelines identified in M.P.E.P section 2141 which state that "[i]n determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

As this section clearly indicates, "[o]bviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992)."

Moreover, it has been legally established that "[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430

P17233.A15

(Fed. Cir. 1990) Although a prior art device 'may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so.' 916 F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432.). See also *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (flexible landscape edging device which is conformable to a ground surface of varying slope not suggested by combination of prior art references)."

Additionally, it has been held that "[a] statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been 'well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention was made' because the references relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed invention were individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish a prima facie case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993)."

Thus, Applicant submits that there is no motivation or rationale disclosed or suggested in the art to modify the applied reference in the manner asserted by the Examiner. Nor does the Examiner's opinion provide a proper basis for these features or for the motivation to modify this document, in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant submits that the invention as recited in at least independent claims 1 and 33 is not rendered obvious by any reasonable inspection and interpretation of the disclosure of the applied references.

P17233.A15

Further, Applicant submits that claims 4-19 and 22-32 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from an allowable base claim and because these claims recite additional features that further define the present invention. In particular, Applicant submits that no proper combination of BENTELE in view of EP 0 752 495 discloses or suggests, in combination: the fibrous material web comprising at least one of a paper web and a cardboard web, as recited in claim 4; a line force differential between the shoe press unit and the counter roll being changeable with the pressure differential, as recited in claim 5; a cross-section of the pressure differential being produced lateral to the web travel direction, the cross-section of the pressure differential being changeable so different pressure differentials are adjustable over the width, as recited in claim 6; the line force in the roll nip changeable by way of the pressure differential, as recited in claim 7; line forces that are at least essentially even being adjusted in the roll nip by way of the variable pressure differential, as recited in claim 8; one of the pressure differential and the line force differential being continuously changeable in areas, as recited in claim 9; the internal pressure produced by the at least one first support element being changeable to change the pressure differential, as recited in claim 10; the internal pressure produced by the at least one second support element being changeable to change the pressure differential, as recited in claim 11; both the internal pressure produced by the at least one first support element and the internal pressure produced by the at least one second support element being changeable to change the pressure

P17233.A15

differential, as recited in claim 12; the at least one first support element and the at least one second support element being connected to the common pressure fluid line, the adjustment device comprising the adjustable pressure reduction device provided in at least one of the pressure fluid connection between the common pressure fluid line and the at least one first support element, and the pressure fluid connection between the common pressure fluid line and the at least one second support element, the pressure differential being changeable by the adjustable pressure reduction device, as recited in claim 13; at least one of the at least one first support element and the at least one second support element being connected to the common pressure fluid line one of individually, in groups, and all together, as recited in claim 14; the adjustable pressure reduction device being provided between at least one of the groups of the at least one second support element and the common pressure fluid line, thereby reducing the pressure of the at least one second support element connected to the common pressure fluid line in groups, as recited in claim 15; the adjustable pressure reduction device being provided between at least one individual at least one second support element and the common pressure fluid line, thereby reducing the pressure of the at least one second support element individually connected to the common pressure fluid line, as recited in claim 16; the adjustable pressure reduction device including at least one variably adjustable valve, as recited in claim 17; at least one of the pressure differential and the line force differential being externally adjustable, as recited in claim 18; at least one of the

P17233.A15

pressure differential and the line force differential being adjustable by one of mechanically, hydraulically, pneumatically, manually, by remote control, at the site, from a control position, and in a process-guided manner, as recited in claim 19; the pressure differential being adjustable by way of a regulating system that includes at least one closed regulation loop, as recited in claim 22; a line force in a second roll nip formed between the third roll and a fourth roll being changeable by way of the pressure differential, as recited in claim 23; at least one of the counter roll and the third roll being cambered, as recited in claim 24; the third roll, the fourth roll, and the counter roll being cambered, as recited in claim 25; the shoe press unit comprising a shoe press roll and the flexible press belt, the flexible press belt comprising a flexible press jacket, as recited in claim 26; the shoe press unit disposed above the counter roll, as recited in claim 27; the ends of the roll jacket of the counter roll being supported on the relevant carrier so that the roll jacket cannot move radially, as recited in claim 28; an action plane of the at least one second support element of the counter roll inclined slightly in relation to a second action plane of the at least one first support element of the shoe press unit, wherein an inclination angle lies in a range from about 2° to 15°, as recited in claim 29; the inclination angle lies in a range from about 4° to 8°, as recited in claim 30; an action plane of the at least one second support element of the counter roll coinciding, at least essentially, with a second action plane of the at least one first support element of the shoe press unit, as recited in claim 31; and comprising pressure-active surfaces of the at least one

P17233.A15

second support element being not equal to second pressure-active surfaces of the at least one first support element of the shoe press unit, as recited in claim 32.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

Over Bentele with EP '495 and Smook

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over BENTELE in view of EP '495 and further in view of SMOOK.

The Examiner acknowledges that BENTELE as modified by EP '495 lacks, among other things, cambered additional rolls. However, the Examiner asserted that this is taught by SMOOK and that it would have been obvious to modify the device taught by BENTELE and EP '495 to include this feature.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Notwithstanding the Office Action assertions as to what each of these documents disclose or suggest, Applicant submits that no proper modification or combination of the above-noted documents discloses or suggests: inter alia, an adjustment device arranged to change a pressure differential between the internal pressures generated by the at least one first support element acting on the flexible press belt of the shoe press unit, and the at least one second support element acting on the roll

P17233.A15

jacket of the counter roll, said adjustment device being structured and arranged to adjust the pressure differential as at least one of a function of a line force in the roll nip by predeterminable characteristic curves, and a function of line force correction procedures for the roll nip, and *an electronic control coupled to an adjustment device, whereby the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential, much less, that the line force correction procedures are at least one of input by way of an electronic control and produced by way of corresponding signals of a process guidance system, and that adjustment of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

In addition to the arguments presented above with regard to BENTELE and EP '495, Applicant submits that SMOOK lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to, among other things, the combination of a first roll nip formed by first and second rolls and an additional roll nip formed by a third roll and one of the first and second rolls, much less, that *the adjustment of the pressure differential provides cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, as recited in amended claims 1 and 33. Moreover, the Examiner has identified no disclosure or suggestion in SMOOK with regard to adjusting the pressure differential in first and second support elements of the first and second rolls in order to *provide cross-section corrections in the roll nip*, i.e., adjusting the pressure differential in the first and second support elements and in order to provide cross-section corrections in another roll nip formed by one of the first

P17233.A15

and second rolls and a third roll. It is also apparent that SMOOK clearly lacks any disclosure or suggestion with regard to *the line force correction procedures being at least one of input by way of an electronic control and produced by way of corresponding signals of a process guidance system*. Finally, it is clear that SMOOK similarly fails disclose or suggest an electronic control, much less, one *coupled to an adjustment device* and/or that *the electronic control and the adjustment device adjust the pressure differential*.

Because each of the applied documents fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-noted features of the instant invention, Applicant submits that no proper modification or combination of these documents can render unpatentable the combination of features recited in at least claim 1.

Further, even assuming, *arguendo*, that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these documents, (which Applicant submits it would not be), Applicant notes that such a combination would nevertheless fail to result in a device or method that includes the particular combination of features recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to modify any of these documents in a manner which would render obvious Applicant's invention.

Additionally, Applicant submits that claim 25 is allowable at least for the reason that this claim depends from an allowable base claim and because this claim recites additional features that further define the present invention. In particular, Applicant submits that no

P17233.A15

proper combination of BENTELE in view of EP '495 and SMOOK discloses or suggests, in combination: the third roll, the fourth roll, and the counter roll being cambered, as recited in claim 25.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that this claim is allowable.

Over DE '443 and EP '495

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 4-19 and 22-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 195 20 443 in view of EP 0 752 495.

The Examiner acknowledges that DE '443 lacks, among other things, a pressure fluid line arranged to generate internal pressures by the first and second support elements, an adjustment device arranged to change a pressure differential between the internal pressures generated by the first and second support elements, that the first and second support elements are pressure fluid-actuated, that the first and second support elements are connected to a common pressure fluid line, and non-equal pressure-active surfaces. However, the Examiner asserted that EP '495 discloses these features and that it would have been obvious to modify DE '443 to include these features in view of the teachings of EP '495.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for reasons presented above with regard to the combination of BENTELE and EP '495 and based on the fact that DE '443 is the

P17233.A15

priority document of BENTELE, and is believed to substantially disclose the same subject matter as BENTELE.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

Over DE '443 with EP '495 and Smook

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE '443 in view of EP '495 and further in view of SMOOK.

The Examiner acknowledges that DE '443 as modified by EP '495 lacks, among other things, cambered additional rolls. However, the Examiner asserted that this is taught by SMOOK and that it would have been obvious to modify the device taught by DE '443 and EP '495 to include this feature.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for reasons presented above with regard to the combination of BENTELE, EP '495 and SMOOK based on the fact that DE '443 is the priority document of BENTELE, and is believed to substantially disclose the same subject matter as BENTELE.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and indicate that this claim is allowable.

P17233.A15

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's invention, as recited in each of the pending claims. The applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to refund excess payments and charge any additional fee necessary to have this paper entered to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,
H. PRINZING et al.



Neil F. Greenblum
Reg. No. 28,394 *35013*

September 29, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191